

LPNP POLICY No:	POLICY TITLE	COMMENT IN QUESTIONNAIRE	DATE & TIME OF COMMENT	RESPONSE
		<p>To the Steering Group Members,</p> <p>We fully support the Draft Lewknor Parish Neighbourhood Plan as drafted. We have made some comments on two of the Policies below but these are only of a minor nature for your consideration. This is an excellent document: so very well presented, concise and intelligent, I can only imagine the time it must have taken to research and to prepare. Many congratulations and our sincere thanks to you all! Tara and Ian Hargrove</p>	<p>Jul 23 2020 05:12 PM</p>	<p>Supportive of plan</p>
		<p>The village characteristics and blend of historical architecture with the flora and fauna of the natural environment is critical to the character of the village.</p>	<p>Jul 23 2020 04:21 PM</p>	<p>Supportive of plan</p>

	<p>The policies relating to supporting community facilities, such as the school, are welcome as are the proposals about better pedestrian access.</p> <p>The main area of contention could be the level of development allowed for. This is restricted to existing boundaries which are tightly drawn around the existing built form. Therefore in effect only very limited infilling or redevelopment would be allowed. Whilst major new development would not be desirable or supported, opportunities for supporting local needs would be limited also. The plan does not assess the long term viability of the school if opportunities for new families to move into or stay in the village are limited. I feel that the rest is uncontentious and should be supported.</p>	<p>Jul 21 2020 04:05 PM</p>	<p>The PC and SODC will determine the appropriate prevailing housing mix needs of the parish at the relevant time and this wording permits changes overtime to be accounted for. Pupils already attend the school who are from outside the parish. There will also be turnover in the housing market with new families coming into the parish.</p>
	<p>More to be done for Postcombe - we seem to lose out to Lewknor village in terms of amenities</p>	<p>Jul 20 2020 12:08 PM</p>	<p>Plan is supportive of amenities across the parish. Pass comment to Parish Council</p>

	I am keen to see the unique unspoilt nature to be maintained.	Jul 19 2020 04:25 PM	Supportive of plan
	16 Paper response from PG entered 19/07/2020  NO RESPONSE  One child per couple as was in China	Jul 19 2020 11:24 AM	Noted
	15 Paper response from PG entered 19/07/2020  Response as Lewknor (not in Village)	Jul 19 2020 11:22 AM	
	8 paper from PG entered 01/07/2020 More emphasis should be given to screening Lewknor and Postcombe from Motorway noise	Jul 16 2020 07:54 PM	Not within remit of neighbourhood plan. Pass comment to Parish Council
	5 Paper from PG entered 25/05/2020  Lewknor has sufficient number of houses especially for the size of the school  WRITTEN RESPONSE ENTERED J KNIGHT EMAIL FROM P GARDENER 24/6/20	Jul 16 2020 07:28 PM	Noted - supportive of the plan

		I dislike the thought of almost all villages in the UK being surrounded by "affordable housing" which lack character and spoil the overall look and feel of the village. It is important to have a group of residents that protect planning and development from landowners simply trying to make money without respecting the local environment so I am in full support of this.	Jul 13 2020 11:23 AM	Noted
		Any further building would swamp the existing capacity of Lewknor and destroy the character of the village	Jul 10 2020 03:25 PM	Plan is against significant development
		I don't think this plan addresses the gaps the village has in attracted younger adults looking for starter homes. By focusing in the housing needs of existing residents this skews towards the current demographic. Our village has a responsibility to cater for the broader needs of Oxfordshire's rural population and to target expansion there.	Jul 07 2020 10:15 PM	Plan is supportive of the requirements of the SODC Local Plan, which directs development to larger villages and towns. The neighbourhood plan responds to ythe needs of the parish.
		I don't know enough about it to know whether I object or support the planet this stage	Jul 04 2020	Noted

			03:09 PM	
		A Parish Neighbourhood Plan is an important document for the long term future of the area, it's a way for local residents to express their views as long as District Planning realise this, without interference from Government	Jul 04 2020 01:57 PM	Noted
		None	Jul 04 2020 10:01 AM	
		I think that it's a very good idea to create a NP as it shows local residents care about shaping the future of their local area, and can be used to ensure over development doesn't take place	Jul 01 2020 12:22 AM	Noted
		Why is there no settlement boundary plan for South Weston - this seems to be a significant omission	Jun 15 2020 09:56 AM	South Weston is an unsuitable location for development as per the Local Plan, therefore it is outside the two settlement boundaries and treated as countryside as described in the Neighbourhood Plan.
		We do not support the plan although we congratulate the committee for doing an excellent job and producing an excellent document. The document however could be improved, at least in so far as	Jul 29 2020 05:55 PM	These comments are by representatives of the Adwell Estate, landowners of land adjoining Postcombe. The NP is obliged to reflect the views of the residents of Lewknor Parish and, of those that responded, all the residents of Postcombe and a significant majority of the wider parish are in support of the plan and the proposed Settlement Boundaries.

		<p>Postcombe is concerned, and our focus is on Postcombe village, not on Lewknor or South Weston. Postcombe is very different in nature from Lewknor and the same objectives should not apply. Lewknor has a thriving school, a popular pub and a well used community hall (with great plans for more community use of St Margaret's Church). Lewknor has had the benefit of some housing development over the past few years and this has added to the community there. Postcombe is, in contrast, a place with potential, so far unreached.</p> <p>In our response to the neighbourhood plan we seek to make some constructive suggestions as to how it might be improved.</p>		
		<p>We do not support the plan although we congratulate the committee for doing an excellent job and producing an excellent document. The document however could be improved, at least in so far as</p>	<p>Jul 29 2020 05:41 PM</p>	

	<p>Postcombe is concerned, and our focus is on Postcombe village, not on Lewknor or South Weston. Postcombe is very different in nature from Lewknor and the same objectives should not apply. Lewknor has a thriving school, a popular pub and a well used community hall (with great plans for more community use of St Margaret's Church). Lewknor has had the benefit of some housing development over the past few years and this has added to the community there. Postcombe is, in contrast, a place with potential, so far unreached.</p> <p>In our response to the neighbourhood plan we seek to make some constructive suggestions as to how it might be improved.</p>		
	<p>We congratulate and thank those who have worked on the plan which is an impressive work. However we do object to some aspects of it in relation to Postcombe. Postcombe is a very different</p>	<p>Jul 29 2020 04:00 PM</p>	

		<p>village to Lewknor and South Weston and should have a very different plan to the one which has been drafted for Lewknor, which generally speaking we support. Postcombe is a village away from the AONB and the Chilterns and is not much of a "thriving community" like Lewknor with the school and popular pub (and quite a lot of recent development to assist in that atmosphere. It is interesting that Tetsworth has also built and is continuing to build houses in order to develop a more positive atmosphere, whereas Postcombe is at risk of not "moving forward" if this plan is adopted..</p>		
		<p>I VERY MUCH APPRECIATE THE WORK WHICH HAS GONE INTO THE PLAN BY THE COMMITTEE WHO HAVE PRODUCED A THOUGHTFUL DRAFT. I FEEL THAT POSTCOMBE AND LEWKNOR ARE VERY MUCH TWO DIFFERENT VILLAGES, ONE IN THE FOOTHILLS OF THE CHILTERNs AND ON THE EDGE</p>	<p>Jul 29 2020 01:25 PM</p>	



		OF THE AONB WITH A THRIVING PUB AND PRIMARY SCHOOL, AND THE OTHER, POSTCOMBE, STRADDLING THE A40 TRUNK ROAD WITHOUT MUCH OF A CENTRE/SOLE. IN MY VIEW THIS IS AN OPPORTUNITY FOR POSTCOMBE TO TRY TO DEVELOP INTO MORE OF A COMMUNITY WITH A PURPOSE AND THIS DRAFT IS NOT GOING TO ACHIEVE THIS.		
SS1	Settlement Boundaries - Lewknor and Postcombe	NO RESPONSE	Jul 27 2020 08:29 AM	
		B	Jul 26 2020 06:37 AM	
		Beacon View is part of the Lewknor village so should be included within the village boundary	Jul 25 2020 07:55 PM	Beacon View is a significant distance from other houses in Lewknor, therefore it is outside the settlement boundary and treated as countryside.

	<p>Postcombe settlement boundary should be modified to include Box Tree Lane buildings - Box Tree Cottage was originally a pub and historical records show in Postcmbe. Should recent farm application in Salt Lane be included - barns there already, surely this is part of the boundary?</p>	<p>Jul 25 2020 10:15 AM</p>	<p>Box Tree Lane buildings are judged to be separate from the village. Application for 4 bedroom house next to new barn in Salt Lane in principle permission refused <a href="http://www.southoxon.gov.uk/ccm/support/Main.jsp?MODULE=ApplicationDetails&amp;REF=P20/S0617/PIP#exactline">http://www.southoxon.gov.uk/ccm/support/Main.jsp?MODULE=ApplicationDetails&amp;REF=P20/S0617/PIP#exactline</a></p>
	<p>As a general comment, Lewknor has been remarkably successful in integrating (in the very broad sense of the word) the various new developments into the village's life over the twenty years or so we have lived here, largely because the size and timing of the developments have allowed it. We were particularly concerned that the large number of houses involved in the potential Watlington Road development may well have created a "village within a village" with the many consequent problems that this can bring. It is very important that the scale and timing of any future developments are</p>	<p>Jul 23 2020 05:12 PM</p>	<p>Noted</p>

		such to allow for the proper integration of each development into village life.		
		It is vital that where need drives development, it is done in a way that is sympathetic to the character of the small village. It is vital to the history and characted of the village that it is not allowed to expand or sprawl through development.	Jul 23 2020 04:23 PM	Noted.
		See comments in box on previous page: "The policies relating to supporting community facilities, such as the school, are welcome as are the proposals about better pedestrian access. The main area of contention could be the level of development allowed for. This is restricted to existing boundaries which are tightly drawn around the existing built form. Therefore in effect only very limited infilling or redevelopment would be allowed. Whilst major new development would not be desirable or supported,	Jul 21 2020 04:05 PM	See same comment above

	opportunities for supporting local needs would be limited also. The plan does not assess the long term viability of the school if opportunities for new families to move into or stay in the village are limited. I feel that the rest is uncontentious and should be supported."		
	"Proposals for development outside the boundaries will only be supported if they accord with policies of the Development Plan that manage development in the countryside" - would not support this part of the policy	Jul 21 2020 12:15 PM	Noted
	to be honest I am not sure what it all means	Jul 20 2020 08:37 AM	Noted
	I am unclear why housing infill is necessary and what changes will be required if permitted to support it without resulting in spoiling of the environment.	Jul 19 2020 04:28 PM	If infill is proposed it should be appropriate and comply with all the other policies.
	NO RESPONSE  Children and wars are the cause of all our consternation, Me old keen an old has been, was subject to temptation	Jul 19 2020 11:31 AM	Noted

		NO RESPONSE	Jul 19 2020 11:22 AM	Noted
		The large areas both sides of Weston Road could be put inside the parish boundaries.  - Marked on the Lewknor Settlement Boundary map the field behind the crescent and Manor Close on Weston Road and the Knapp Farm orchard to north west of Weston Road.	Jul 17 2020 09:26 PM	This would result in a large increase in the size of Lewknor and the areas are outside the built up area which would not be in line with the Local Plan or the needs or wishes of residents. Weston Road could not cope with significantly more traffic.
		AGREE	Jul 16 2020 07:28 PM	
		Postcombe – why doesn't boundary include Box Tree Lane and also up to Three Lands Cottage on the Chalford Road? Otherwise support this.	Jul 16 2020 07:26 PM	This would result in a large increase in the size of Postcombe and the areas are outside the built up area which would not be in line with the Local Plan or the needs or wishes of residents.
		I don't agree that the local area can support it sustain new development of any kind, where it isn't the off but if infill. I don't see any need to develop new houses outside of the current settlement boundaries	Jul 04 2020 03:12 PM	In agreement with policy

	As shown recently Planning proposals that are outside the Village boundaries need to be strongly resisted	Jul 04 2020 02:01 PM	In agreement with policy.
	None	Jul 04 2020 10:01 AM	
	I note that Box Tree House & Lavender Cottage are considered to be outwith the Postcombe boundary. That kinda leaves the intervening plot vulnerable to in-fill development. This is not a practical proposition. It has been tried before - I can provide amplification should this be of interest.	Jun 26 2020 09:14 AM	This is based on a misunderstanding of the policy. Areas outside the settlement boundaries would not be supported for development.
	The Lewknor Settlement Plan omits The Manor/Nethercote Barn/StraightSix etc - yet this is an area with a current contentious application and likely to be an area of further potentially unsuitable development	Jun 15 2020 10:00 AM	This is based on a misunderstanding of the policy. Areas outside the settlement boundaries would not be supported for development.

	<p>We do not support the proposed Settlement Boundary for Postcombe for the following reasons:</p> <p>1.1. The proposed boundary is extremely restrictive, and in fact seeks to limit development to an area somewhat less than the current footprint of the village.</p> <p>1.2. There is pressure on housing in this part of England and the Draft makes no concession for the need to build new houses;</p> <p>1.3. The pressure for new houses comes in a number of ways: pressure because people want to live in this part of England; pressure because our young people cannot afford to buy property because of house prices; pressure because the land bank in this part of England is small; pressure because of restrictions on planning permission in this part of England.</p>	<p>Jul 29 2020 05:55 PM</p>	<p>These comments are by representatives of the Adwell Estate, landowners of land adjoining Postcombe. The NP is obliged to reflect the views of the residents of Lewknor Parish and, of those that responded, all the residents of Postcombe and a significant majority of the wider parish are in support of the plan and the proposed Settlement Boundaries.</p> <p>There is not a requirement for the parish to provide extra housing, that is under the local plan to be provided elsewhere in the district.</p> <p>In respect of comments on the Settlement Boundary which 100% of the residents that responded to the questionnaire supported:</p> <p>1.4.1 This is a frontage of 144 metres, which is more than would be considered infill and would change the character of this area, which has only the odd property opposite</p> <p>1.4.2 This frontage is 136 metres, which is more than would be considered infill, there are no properties opposite.</p> <p>1.4.3 This is private land, not in the control of the parish or this landowner. There is no building there to develop.</p> <p>1.4.4 This would be a significant extension of the village</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>1.4. With regard to the Settlement Boundary proposed:</p> <p>1.4.1. The boundary excludes the possibility of any development on land on the west of Box Tree Lane (incorrectly described as Lower Road on the plan) between the A40 and Sunnyview. Clearly this would be infilling and therefore should not be objectionable in principle. The roadside has been developed on the east side of the road and therefore there should be no objection to some development where appropriate on the west side of the road;</p> <p>1.4.2. From Sunnyview to Lavender. Again, this is infilling in the existing footprint of the village and should be open to development in principle.</p> <p>1.4.3. Land on corner of Box Tree Lane/A40 opposite pub. We mention this because it is where the old Reading Room</p>		
--	--	--	--	--



	<p>is. This has been neglected by the village and allowed to fall to ruin. It is a community asset which is not mentioned in the draft. Clearly this is something about which a policy needs to be developed and it would be a pity if the opportunity was not taken when drafting the plan.</p> <p>1.4.4. The land behind Poplars Farm/ Adwell Farm and the Stud. Potentially this is land where development could take place without imposing on the Box Tree Lane/Lower Road area. To create a mixed development of houses here may well be something which the village could benefit greatly from in the future. We are aware of the refusal of planning permission for the land to the rear of Poplars Farm, but we believe that with foresight for the future of the village this may be an exciting development for Postcombe as a whole.</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>We do not support the proposed Settlement Boundary for Postcombe for the following reasons:</p> <p>1.1. The proposed boundary is extremely restrictive, and in fact seeks to limit development to an area somewhat less than the current footprint of the village.</p> <p>1.2. There is pressure on housing in this part of England and the Draft makes no concession for the need to build new houses;</p> <p>1.3. The pressure for new houses comes in a number of ways: pressure because people want to live in this part of England; pressure because our young people cannot afford to buy property because of house prices; pressure because the land bank in this part of England is small; pressure because of restrictions on planning permission in this part of England.</p>	<p>Jul 29 2020 05:41 PM</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>1.4. With regard to the Settlement Boundary proposed:</p> <p>1.4.1. The boundary excludes the possibility of any development on land on the west of Box Tree Lane (incorrectly described as Lower Road on the plan) between the A40 and Sunnyview. Clearly this would be infilling and therefore should not be objectionable in principle. The roadside has been developed on the east side of the road and therefore there should be no objection to some development where appropriate on the west side of the road;</p> <p>1.4.2. From Sunnyview to Lavender. Again, this is infilling in the existing footprint of the village and should be open to development in principle.</p> <p>1.4.3. Land on corner of Box Tree Lane/A40 opposite pub. We mention this because it is where the old Reading Room</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>is. This has been neglected by the village and allowed to fall to ruin. It is a community asset which is not mentioned in the draft. Clearly this is something about which a policy needs to be developed and it would be a pity if the opportunity was not taken when drafting the plan.</p> <p>1.4.4. The land behind Poplars Farm/ Adwell Farm and the Stud. Potentially this is land where development could take place without imposing on the Box Tree Lane/Lower Road area. To create a mixed development of houses here may well be something which the village could benefit greatly from in the future. We are aware of the refusal of planning permission for the land to the rear of Poplars Farm, but we believe that with foresight for the future of the village this may be an exciting development for Postcombe as a whole.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

	<p>The proposed Settlement Boundaries for Postcombe restrict the opportunity to create more housing very severely, and there really is no opportunity for development save for some very limited infilling. In our view this is a pity because a village such as Postcombe could greatly benefit from additional houses, and it will be difficult for young people to move into or stay in Postcombe if the plan is adopted.</p> <p>We have the following specific points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. West of Box Tree Lane (it is wrongly marked as Lower Road at this point) from the pub to Sunny View. It is noted that the Settlement Boundary prevents any development along this roadside. This would be a possible site for a few houses which would infill the sector between the existing houses and Sunny View. There is some reasonably recent development on the other</li> </ol>	<p>Jul 29 2020 04:20 PM</p>	<p>These comments are the same as those by representatives of the Adwell Estate, landowners of land adjoining Postcombe. The NP is obliged to reflect the views of the residents of Lewknor Parish and, of those that responded, all the residents of Postcombe and a significant majority of the wider parish are in support of the plan and the proposed Settlement Boundaries.</p> <p>There is not a requirement for the parish to provide extra housing, that is under the local plan to be provided elsewhere in the district.</p> <p>In respect of comments on the Settlement Boundary which 100% of the residents that responded to the questionnaire supported:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This is a frontage of 144 metres, more than would be considered infill and would change the character of this area with only the odd property opposite</li> <li>2. This frontage is 136 metres, more than would be considered infill, there are no properties opposite.</li> <li>3. This is private land, not in the control of the parish or this landowner. There is no building there to develop.</li> <li>4. This would be a significant extension of the village</li> </ol>
--	---	---	--

		<p>side of Box Tree Lane and it is difficult to see how the plan should exclude the possibility of development of this sector.</p> <p>2. Between Sunny View and Lavender Cottages. As above, this could provide housing for people and would again be infilling within the boundary of the village.</p> <p>3. Fields behind Poplars Farm, Adwell Farm and the Stud. Although this would be a more significant development (and of course planning has recently been turned down for a small development behind Poplars Farm) there is much to be said for keeping the option open within the Plan. For Postcombe to have a "significant" development and increase the number of houses, much as has occurred in Tetsworth (and to some extent in Lewknor) would create a far more vibrant atmosphere and a more sustainable future for the village.</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>4. Land on corner of "Lower Road" (aka Box Tree Lane) and A40. It is interesting that there is no mention of the Postcombe Reading Room in the draft plan. This building was built in 1860 for the benefit of Postcombe and has now fallen into total disrepair. This is a community asset which could be a centre for village life (with the greatest respect neither the pub nor the garage fulfil that function) and it is perhaps indicative of the lack of a village community that the Reading Room has not even got a mention in the Draft. With the Settlement Boundary as it is currently drafted there would be no opportunity to develop that site and perhaps recreate a community asset for the benefit of the whole village.</p>		
		<p>As long as any development within the boundary is within keeping of its surroundings ie not a 2/3 storey house amid bungalows.</p>	<p>Jul 29 2020 02:01 PM</p>	<p>The density, scale and arrangement of buildings should reflect their respective area under DC1</p>

	<p>I do not agree with the delineation of the settlement boundary in Postcombe. It is extremely restrictive and really gives very little scope for developing the village into something with more of a "hub".</p> <p>I take the boundary in sectors to illustrate my point:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The road frontage on the West side of "Lower Road" (infact it is Box Tree Lane at this point) between the A40 turning by the pub and Sunny View. This road frontage is clearly infill development but has been excluded from being within the settlement boundary. Of course there may be reasons why this frontage should not be developed for housing and this may be considered by the Parish and Local Council at the time when an application is made. But it is wholly incorrect for the parish in its plan to exclude the possibility of development at this stage of the process. Box Tree Lane</li> </ol>	<p>Jul 29 2020 02:00 PM</p>	<p>These comments are by representatives of the Adwell Estate, landowners of land adjoining Postcombe. The NP is obliged to reflect the views of the residents of Lewknor Parish and, of those that responded, all the residents of Postcombe and a significant majority of the wider parish are in support of the plan and the proposed Settlement Boundaries.</p> <p>There is not a requirement for the parish to provide extra housing, that is under the local plan to be provided elsewhere in the district.</p> <p>In respect of comments on the Settlement Boundary which 100% of the residents that responded to the questionnaire supported:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This is a frontage of 144 metres, more than would be considered infill and would change the character of this area with only the odd property opposite</li> <li>2. This frontage is 136 metres, more than would be considered infill, there are no properties opposite.</li> <li>3. This is private land, not in the control of the parish or this landowner. There is no building there to develop.</li> <li>4. This would be a significant extension of the village</li> </ol>
--	---	---	--



		<p>is a lane where development has taken place on the East side, and there is no good reason why it should not be developed on the west side. We of course accept that in developing the west side of the road there would possibly be a change to the character of the lane, and of course that is to some extent inevitable with any development, but that is not a good reason to exclude the possibility of development there.</p> <p>2. The road frontage from Sunnyview to Lavender cottage. Again this is infill development and there is no reason why this should be excluded from the Settlement Boundary for the reasons set out in 1 above. It is true that the other side of the road has not been developed, but in order that Postcombe becomes a thriving village there is in my view no doubt that we need to build more houses in a sympathetic style to fit in with the existing village.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>3. East side of Box Tree lane on corner with A40. It is significant that this has also been marked outside the settlement boundary even though the old Reading Room, abandoned and now derelict, is on that corner. This is, in my view, reflective of the lack of "core" to the village that the Reading Room has over the years been allowed to fall into disrepair and that it has been overlooked in this draft plan. It would be good to have a plan which started with an objective to enhance the village of Postcombe by perhaps rebuilding the reading room so that the village had more of a core. But unfortunately this building has not been mentioned in the plan and has been overlooked in the Settlement Boundary.</p> <p>4. Clearly more controversial in terms of disagreement with the proposed boundary, in particular in view of the recent failed planning application in the field behind</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>Poplars Farm is the development of the land behind Poplars Farm, Adwell Farm and the Stud. If Postcombe is to become a thriving community it needs to leave open the option of a rather more ambitious plan, with houses being developed in those fields. We do of course understand the sensitivities, but these can and should be dealt with when an application is made, not at this stage by restricting the Settlement Boundary so tightly. We would propose that the settlement boundary allows for development in these fields, subject of course to the normal application process.</p> <p>The choice for Postcombe is whether it wishes to have the option of developing into a thriving community or to restrict itself to its current boundaries (or indeed, under the current proposal in the draft, to restrict the Settlement Boundary to even less than the natural, existing</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

		boundary of the village. In our view it would be a great pity if the Neighbourhood Plan restricted it in this way.		
CH1	Conserving Heritage	NO RESPONSE	Jul 27 2020 08:29 AM	
		Box Tree House was originally a village Public House more	Jul 25 2020	Same response as previous similar comment

	than 100 years , should be included in settlement plan.	10:16 AM	
	The area to be conserved is essential to protecting the history of the village.  As someone who resides partially within the conservation area (our garden is dissected by the conservation line) I feel very strongly that the area is protected.	Jul 23 2020 05:12 PM	In agreement with policy
	No comments	Jul 23 2020 05:12 PM	
	Think that using an arbitrary figure of 100 doesn't seem necessary. I think that a property within the conservation area and the whole parish must conserve or enhance the area to which the development proposal applies	Jul 21 2020 12:19 PM	Resolved through changes suggested by statutory consultees
	NO RESPONSE  A condom tax	Jul 19 2020 11:31 AM	Noted
	§ This depends on what is meant by "enhance". It must be recognised that some modern buildings can	Jul 19 2020 11:22 AM	Wording would be interpreted in the individual context by the Parish Council, SODC and any planning inspector.

		"enhance" areas. Eg – the Louvre Pyramid		
		No response on paper	Jul 17 2020 09:22 PM	
		It would be easy to block starter homes simply because they can't as easily be made to look like the more classic and larger dwellings of the conservation area.	Jul 07 2020 10:36 PM	It is possible to design starter homes to fit within the context of any given area
		My thoughts are that they should conserve the area but it is unlikely that any will enhance the area therefore not sure why this phrase is necessary	Jul 06 2020 07:44 PM	Noted
		In theory I agree with this but haven't been impressed with examples I've seen to date of this "conserve or enhance style"	Jul 04 2020 03:13 PM	Noted
		Most definitely	Jul 04 2020 02:02 PM	Noted
		None	Jul 04 2020 10:01 AM	
		"Enhance" is of course very subjective and perhaps some	Jun 15 2020	This would be interpreted in the individual context by the Parish Council, SODC and any planning inspector

		context or examples might be helpful	10:01 AM	
CH2	Landscape Character	Would like more information about circumstances where benefit of development on SSSI would outweigh the impact	Jul 25 2020 08:05 PM	This would be interpreted in the individual context by the Parish Council, SODC and any planning inspector
		Mention should be made of clear footpaths and the Funeral Path.	Jul 25 2020 10:17 AM	Covered in policy FI3
		No comments.	Jul 23 2020 05:12 PM	
		With the size of the Parish there is big diversity of the land that forms this large area. I believe the AONB should continue to be very important, and a dark landscape	Jul 23 2020 03:19 PM	Noted - policy CH4 covers the AONB
		NO RESPONSE	Jul 19 2020 11:32 AM	
		NO RESPONSE	Jul 19 2020 11:22 AM	
		With the size of the Parish there is big diversity of the	Jul 18 2020	Noted - policy CH4 covers the AONB

		land that forms the large area. I believe the AONB should continue to be very important and a "dark" landscape	05:53 PM	
		Although it would be nice to see the parish actually support the local AONB and nature reserves, rather than simply take the benefits. If members of the village were actually to pop over to Aston Rowant or up to the AONB office in chinnor, and offer support this would be very welcome I'm sure.	Jul 07 2020 10:37 PM	Noted Refer to Parish Council
		Again, yes in theory	Jul 04 2020 03:14 PM	Noted
		None	Jul 04 2020 10:02 AM	
		We tend to focus on the obvious parish views from the Chilterns but should not ignore others & to the north west we are likely to see a significant planning application(s) for solar development	Jun 15 2020 10:05 AM	Unclear where the respondent is referring to. The 'north west' might mean areas outside the parish. Views across the parish have been considered and recommendations sought from residents. Protected views include views around South Weston and Postcombe (both north west of Lewknor village)
	1	I very much support this in that it applies to Lewknor and	Jul 29 2020	Noted



		i do not believe that Postcombe is affected by this policy, it not being near the AONB/SSSI	02:02 PM	
	2	The statement that the AONB is a Dark Landscape might be true for some parts but regarding the bit at Lewknor; the lights of High Wycombe are visible in the night sky	Jul 29 2020 01:52 PM	Not according to CPRE map
CH3	Protection of Views	Protect:  Adwell Cop - important view from village (A40), Salt Lane and 'triangle' in Lower Road  Postcombe village from Prospect Hill  Chiltern Ridge from Postcombe	Jul 25 2020 10:20 AM	View is limited to the trees on top of the kop and therefore hard to protect There isn't public access to Prospect Hill (north of Postcombe) LPV10 & LPV11 are of the Chiltern Ridge from Postcombe
		No comments.	Jul 23 2020 05:12 PM	
		NO RESPONSE  A 400 acre wind farm Manor Farm South Weston	Jul 19 2020 11:32 AM	Three views around South Weston protected
		I do think this is most of the village. I would be interested	Jul 07 2020	Noted

		to see how much this leaves to build in.	10:37 PM	
		Extremely good idea to preserve the views of such a beautiful area	Jul 06 2020 07:46 PM	Supportive of policy
		None	Jul 04 2020 10:02 AM	
		<p>Some problems here; on the map:</p> <p>a. LPV10 is actually LPV 9.</p> <p>b. The real LPV10 is off the map to the north.</p> <p>c. LPV13 is actually LPV12</p> <p>d. LPV13 is (probably) marked as LPV15, and needs repositioning on N'cote Lane</p> <p>e. There is no description for an LPV15</p> <p>f. LPV11 - there's no symbol - off the map to the north?</p> <p>g. LPV14 is not from 'the field</p>	Jun 26 2020 09:58 AM	Latest version of the map not included, revised version added on 10 July, part way through the consultation period.

		behind St Margaret Church'; it is correctly located near the Blue X compound  h. LPV16 has a symbol - but no description		
		Development in Postcombe should not be of a height that would impinge on any views within the village, though apparently you do not seem to think that Postcombe has any!	Jul 29 2020 02:07 PM	LP10 and LP11 are views in Postcombe. DC1 ensures appropriate development.
CH4	The Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty	No comments.	Jul 23 2020 05:12 PM	
		I would like clarity around what constitutes "exceptional circumstances".	Jul 19 2020 04:31 PM	Difficult to be prescriptive, To be interpreted in the individual context by the Parish Council, SODC and any planning inspector
		NO RESPONSE	Jul 19 2020 11:32 AM	
		I agree with all except the traditional built character. We	Jul 19 2020	Traditional build character in line with the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide would not be estate character

	want to avoid 'estate character' buildings.	11:22 AM	
	Neither support or object on paper	Jul 17 2020 09:22 PM	Noted
	As previously it is too easy to use this to stop development altogether.	Jul 07 2020 10:37 PM	Exception circumstances would be interpreted by Parish Council, SODC and any planning inspector in individual circumstances
	Support but I don't believe there is adequate infrastructure or amenities able to support any development in the area in excess of infill. Already at capacity and work to develop infrastructure and amenities will definitely have a negative impact on the natural beauty of the area, so I oppose any development proposals on the area on these grounds	Jul 04 2020 03:17 PM	Development in AONB would be refused except in exceptional circumstances
	None	Jul 04 2020 10:02 AM	
	Please note that many of the above policies are "Lewknor centric" and apply to the proximity of Lewknor to the AONB/Chilterns. They do not apply to Postcombe.	Jul 29 2020 04:21 PM	

DC1	Character of Development	Include mention here of Public Rights of Way Include reference to drainage and sewage systems so they do not produce flooding or bio hazard	Jul 25 2020 10:22 AM	Policy F15 Utilities takes up this point
		No comments.	Jul 23 2020 05:12 PM	n/a
		Point 5 "preserve historic plot boundaries, hedgerows and enclosure walls", I feel where a development and extensions enhance this point i also think this is acceptable	Jul 21 2020 12:37 PM	Noted
		Well set back needs to be properly defined.	Jul 19 2020 04:32 PM	Happy with wording to be interpreted by PC/SODC and any inspector
		Condom Glory, Ime a Tory	Jul 19 2020 11:33 AM	noted

		I agree with new properties. However, existing properties should be able to be modernised/extended in a way that may be much more modern. For example, the business which mainly sits next to the Barn in Church Lane. Modern additions to an old building have not detracted from it.	Jul 19 2020 11:22 AM	The policy states 'new developments should be in harmony with the rural character....' this does not rule out a modern addition as can be seen in the parish
		I think that the new development in Postcombe has been done well and in character appropriate to the village.	Jul 16 2020 07:26 PM	Noted
		Older houses in Lewknor are built often close to the road but end on , rather than facing towards the road. This a is a policy that could be followed in new builds?	Jul 09 2020 04:18 PM	The Policy would not prevent this and such design features would be part of an individual planning application
		As before it could be used to stop development altogether. I think Lewknor has quite a hotch potch of housing styles, so I don't understand how this would work in practice.	Jul 07 2020 10:37 PM	The Policy is designed to support appropriate development

	Point 5 is not being upheld at the present time therefore it is essential that this is included to preserve the village character	Jul 06 2020 07:47 PM	Noted
	Again, extensions and infill, but I oppose the development of new housing estates or building outside of current boundaries. Examples in Chinnor and Thame are ghastly and the impact on roads and local towns is already having a noticeable negative effect. We can not afford to allow more of these types of developments. Wholly un-in keeping, spoils the natural beauty, negatively impacts the transport links and just unnecessary. Serves only people who set to make money from the developments	Jul 04 2020 03:21 PM	Noted
	None	Jul 04 2020 10:02 AM	n/a

		Point 3 - some developments are already quite dense (Bloor Homes development Weston Road) so the benchmark needs choosing with care	Jun 15 2020 10:08 AM	Noted
		I do not personally object to the principle of this, but i do object to it being in a neighbourhood plan. All buildings should be judged on their own merit and it should also be recognised that with new development, the need for the housing supply to be rather different now than it was 100 years ago and so on means that we will have to build more houses but smaller houses. Families are smaller, there are more single people etc. A plan should adapt to these changes. The plan does not take sufficient account of these changes in our society.	Jul 29 2020 04:25 PM	Policy HO1 requires a mix of properties appropriate to the prevailing needs of the parish
DC2	Design Principles	However, have to say the recent Salt Lane development flies in the face of these policies. The occlusion of the funeral path was finally resolved after discussion with the estate agent and potential buyer affected money spoke	Jul 25 2020 10:25 AM	Noted



		where nothing else could be enforced		
		No comments.	Jul 23 2020 05:12 PM	n/a
		This is an area that sadly Planning doesn't take note of time and time again, especially with regards to "street scenes". Developers aren't made to ensure that car parking doesn't become the most "dominant" feature.	Jul 23 2020 03:23 PM	Policy DC2 (vii) addresses this comment
		point 11: "it should not include the installation of kerbs to new or existing village lanes". I think that new lanes should have footpaths.	Jul 21 2020 12:46 PM	Comment noted and reported. If there is more support for this suggestion then the inclusion of this suggestion will be considered
			Jul 19 2020 11:34 AM	Redacted for GDPR
		Para 'v' is too narrow. Possibly at the front of buildings to ensure street view remains the same but this should not	Jul 19 2020 11:22 AM	Policy DC3 on sustainability addresses this comment

	<p>be applied at the rear. Many new builds in Lewknor have large amounts of glass at the rear. Para 'v' (I think the respondent means 'vi') new builds need 2 full parking spaces not 1.5. No mention of green technology – solar PV, ASNP, car charging points. The village can't stand still – needs to change with the times.</p>		
	<p>This is one area that sadly Planning doesn't take note, especially in regards to "street scenes" where developers aren't made to ensure that car parking isn't the most dominant feature</p>	<p>Jul 18 2020 05:51 PM</p>	<p>Policy DC2 (vii) addresses this comment</p>
	<p>Particularly support items v, vi and xii.</p>	<p>Jul 16 2020 07:26 PM</p>	<p>Noted - Supports the plan</p>
	<p>Some consideration to access at Jn6 M40 required. Extra development will result in more traffic using this junction. It is dangerous because of hill and slow moving vehicles.</p>	<p>Jul 16 2020 06:15 PM</p>	<p>Policy DC2 (xii) addresses this comment</p>

		Since new build tend to allow for 2 cars per household, any further development which requires traffic travelling along Weston Road with its narrow (and protected) bottleneck should be very stringently queried . Perhaps this could be added?	Jul 09 2020 04:24 PM
		These stipulations relate to the type of development which I oppose and some of these points are going to be impossible or very difficult to achieve	Jul 04 2020 03:23 PM
		None	Jul 04 2020 10:02 AM
		Lighting - directional low impact lighting should be encouraged on fixed timers etc. Too many properties are lit extensively as if they were national monuments! All street furniture should be minimised.	Jun 15 2020 10:11 AM

		<p>We broadly support these principles although we are concerned that a neighbourhood plan might find itself hamstrung in the design principles it espouses. It is in our view important that each planning application is judged on its own merits, and if some come up with innovative proposals which are not in accordance with a neighbourhood plan the council should be flexible. It may be worth predicating the policy by making clear that all development proposals will be judged on their own merits.</p>	<p>Jul 29 2020 05:56 PM</p>	<p>These comments are by representatives of the Adwell Estate, landowners of land adjoining Postcombe. This policy sets appropriate standards for the parish and is supported by 96% of respondents</p>
		<p>We broadly support these principles although we are concerned that a neighbourhood plan might find itself hamstrung in the design principles it espouses. It is in our view important that each planning application is judged on its own merits, and if some come up with innovative proposals which are not in accordance with a neighbourhood plan the council should be flexible. It may be worth predicating the</p>	<p>Jul 29 2020 05:46 PM</p>	

		policy by making clear that all development proposals will be judged on their own merits.		
		But please see our comments above relating to the need for development to reflect modern ways of living.	Jul 29 2020 04:26 PM	
		A number of properties in Postcombe have installed wood sleeper boundaries due to the rising ground from Lower Road. This is to prevent land slippage and should be supported in similar circumstances	Jul 29 2020 01:58 PM	
DC3	Sustainable Design	No comments.	Jul 23 2020 05:12 PM	n/a
		Could write a book about that which I know and a library about which I don't know	Jul 19 2020 11:35 AM	Noted

	How will you enforce this? Once approval given these will be ignored as too costly What about Klargestor to avoid need to link to overburdened drains?	Jul 19 2020 11:22 AM	Through the NP process which impacts on the decision making of the PC and the District Council. Also it is a requirement of the NPFF and LP that if there is insufficient capacity then a new development can't take place
	Left to individual	Jul 17 2020 09:22 PM	Noted
	Only where it is infill, opposed to larger scale development	Jul 04 2020 03:24 PM	Noted
	None	Jul 04 2020 10:03 AM	n/a
	Not all renewable technologies are as sound as they appear. We should strive for greater energy efficiency & EPC performance. Few houses are on mains drainage & much other drainage allows natural water courses & water bodies to become polluted with run off including waste from	Jun 15 2020 10:16 AM	Policy F15 and EN1 pts v,vi,viii addresses this comment

	roads, nitrates and phosphates (hence algae blooms). We need to		
	Adwell Estate do a great deal in supporting and investing in renewable sources of energy but this is an expensive exercise and sometimes unaffordable. We wonder whether it is right to be so prescriptive in requiring "sustainable and recyclable materials, and including renewable energy sources"?	Jul 29 2020 05:49 PM	These comments are by representatives of the Adwell Estate, landowners of land adjoining Postcombe. This policy is supported by 97% of respondents.
	We would point out that the draft does not mention the lack of any mains drainage system in Postcombe. This is a major issue and with the extremely "sticky" clay soil in Postcombe domestic sewage treatment plants are extremely impractical and environmentally damaging. Certainly this is an issue which needs to be addressed in the plan.	Jul 29 2020 04:29 PM	Introduction of mains drainage is outside of the remit of the NP
	Rainwater harvesting should be encouraged to improve surface water management	Jul 29 2020 02:41 PM	Include reference to rainwater harvesting in the narrative:
	Also consider underground rainwater harvesting tanks.	Jul 29 2020	

			02:12 PM	
EN1	WILDLIFE & BIODIVERSITY	NO RESPONSE	Jul 27 2020 08:29 AM	N/A
		B	Jul 26 2020 07:00 AM	UNCLEAR
		Agree with all, however would hope that any scheme large enough to require an attenuation pond would not be considered acceptable	Jul 25 2020 09:24 PM	policy is designed to cover position should a development be approved which requires one
		No comments.	Jul 23 2020 05:12 PM	N/A
		Concerned about biodiversity offset and also the use of attenuation ponds, which appears to mean building on areas with flood risk.	Jul 19 2020 04:35 PM	Requirement for attenuation ponds is only if they are required - policy viii Where any new development requires flood attenuation ponds or new areas of green space they shall be designed to encourage nature conservation and biodiversity
		Agree with all, however would hope that any scheme large enough to require an attenuation pond would not be considered acceptable	Jul 18 2020 05:49 PM	repeat



	Neither support or object on paper	Jul 17 2020 09:22 PM	Noted
	Rats/Rabbits/Squirrels/Deer! No!  Comment in Comment Box – Most of the landscape & stream/water control is fine – but wildlife requires control! Rats, Grey Squirrels, Rabbits, Deer all cause enormous damage & must be managed.	Jul 16 2020 07:23 PM	Noted
	could we remove bats from this ?	Jul 09 2020 04:27 PM	Bats are a protected species and therefore high priority for proactive habitat support
	None	Jul 04 2020 10:03 AM	N/A
	Perhaps the parish might complete a baseline study of species to establish local densities etc. Summer & winter photographic records of the parish would record trees/hedges & other features.	Jun 15 2020 10:19 AM	Pass comment to Parish Council. May fit with NRN

		As above, while we would not want to disassociate Adwell Estate from policies associated with preserving the environment, we wonder whether this is rather prescriptive. Each development has to be looked at on its own merits, and we are not sure that the Neighbourhood Plan needs to grandstand its environmental credentials.	Jul 29 2020 05:57 PM	These comments are by representatives of the Adwell Estate, landowners of land adjoining Postcombe. This policy is supported by 99% of respondents.
		I support this and of course Adwell Estate works hard to improve the environment. There is a concern that to map out in the plan a provision for bat nests could be too intrusive in the plan. Each development has to be looked at individually and a decision made as to whether this kind of protection is required. Often it is not and therefore it is in our view inappropriate to have it in a plan.	Jul 29 2020 04:38 PM	
		Flood attenuation measures must be designed to avoid collateral flooding	Jul 29 2020 02:03 PM	

EN2	ASTON ROWANT NATIONAL NATURE RESERVE	B	Jul 26 2020 07:04 AM	??
		is a Red kite reserve	Jul 25 2020 10:26 AM	UNCLEAR
		No comments.	Jul 23 2020 05:12 PM	N/A
		Neither support or object on paper	Jul 17 2020 09:22 PM	Noted
		As stated previously it would be nice if the village offered more support to the reserve.	Jul 07 2020 10:37 PM	pass comment to Parish Council
		None	Jul 04 2020 10:03 AM	N/A
		Does this conflict with policy CH4 on ChilternsAONB in which Aston Rowant nature reserve sits. CH4 seems stronger than EN2 in its approach to possible development.	Jun 19 2020 04:05 PM	CH4 is more detailed as national and local controls are extremely stringent as to what development can take place in a national nature reserve. Policy EN2 was suggested by Natural England

EN3	HIGH GRADE AGRICULTURAL LAND	I don't believe that development should be located outside the built up areas of all three villages within the Parish, even if it is deemed by a developer "suitable" for a countryside location	Jul 25 2020 09:26 PM	Change policy wording to "that specific countryside location"
		No comments.	Jul 23 2020 05:12 PM	N/A
		"unless the development is necessary" - I don't think this should ever be a necessity.	Jul 21 2020 12:50 PM	It is not just housing but for agricultural use etc. also.
		Happy to support providing the use incorporates increase use of bee germination and zero GM modified crops.	Jul 19 2020 04:37 PM	Does not fall within the remit of neighbourhood planning
		We need a Shop somewhere within walking distance in Lewknor.	Jul 19 2020 03:04 PM	Pass comment to the Parish Council.Does not fall within the remit of neighbourhood planning
		NO RESPONSE	Jul 19 2020	N/A

			11:22 AM	
		I don't believe that development should be located outside the built up areas of all three villages within in the Parish, even if it is deemed by a developer "suitable" for a countryside location	Jul 18 2020 05:47 PM	Change policy wording
		There may be requests for development in other parts of the parish not within the boundaries.	Jul 16 2020 06:13 PM	Noted
		A statement is made that "development will not be supported etc". However the paragraph goes on to say "unless it is necessary and suitable". How can this be a policy, surely it has to be either or.	Jul 06 2020 09:10 PM	Change policy wording
		This reads as: "Will largely true not to build on good quality agricultural land, also of outstanding natural beauty, unless of course there's a lot of money to be made from it, and then we will"	Jul 04 2020 03:26 PM	Noted
		None	Jul 04 2020 10:03 AM	N/A

		Necessary or suitable? Might be in the eyes of a developer but not the parish. Can we have some parameters please?	Jun 15 2020 10:23 AM	Change policy wording
F11	Local Green Spaces	I don't believe that the wording that lists these green spaces should say in exceptional circumstances they "could be" developed. If it is not permitted that should be the stance taken	Jul 25 2020 10:33 PM	Exceptional circumstances will be determined by the PC/SODC/ and/or the Inspector NOT the developer Nature of Green Spaces is described in narrative of LP
		#6 has been utilised over several years, more than 40, by local children, and thus should be, under law of use, under ownership of the village. I have to point out that the boundary ONLY was wooded and the centre an area of play, and it would be beneficial to the village to have this as a local amenity or even for allotments with water laid on.	Jul 25 2020 10:29 AM	Noted - refer to PC
		No comments. In particular, we do hope that this will be sufficient to preserve Knapp	Jul 23 2020 05:12 PM	Noted

		Farm Orchard from new development.		
		Knapp Farm Orchard - Unless this area is developed into a usable space for the community I think a sensitive development might be acceptable	Jul 21 2020 01:01 PM	Noted contrary to most other views
		What constitutes exceptional circumstances?	Jul 19 2020 04:37 PM	See above
		Comment against Local Green Spaces "These are detailed in Appendix 2." ?Where is this?	Jul 19 2020 11:22 AM	Query on location of Appdx 2
		I don't believe any wording should be on a NP when listing these green spaces, that then say in exceptional circumstances they "could" be developed. The wording should be clear that there are no exceptional circumstances for local "green" spaces	Jul 18 2020 05:45 PM	See above
		vi – please see previous comments – why isn't this area actually within the settlement boundary?	Jul 16 2020 07:26 PM	Problem understanding how Settlement boundary works
		Wooded area at Postcombe requires management if it is to have any benefit to the village	Jul 16 2020 06:16 PM	Noted

		This statement again contradicts itself. It makes the statement that "development will not be permitted". It goes on to say "except in exceptional circumstances". This surely must be either or to be a policy.	Jul 06 2020 09:11 PM	See above
		Don't like the inclusion of "exceptional circumstances" again seems like a green light for "lots of money to be made from building a few houses in these key village areas so we have decided it's an exceptional circumstance"	Jul 04 2020 03:27 PM	See above
		None	Jul 04 2020 10:03 AM	Noted
		But see previous comments on the 'wooded area next to Box Tree Hse'. It has been used as play area in the past, but should it ever be reinstated as such, there may be practical constraints associated with its use for the disposal of waste water.	Jun 26 2020 10:10 AM	Noted - refer to PC
		No new development to be permitted on land between Pippins & Villa in Chalford	Jun 17 2020	No need as covered by Settlement boundary



		Road, fronting the A40. To be added to Policy FI1.	03:28 PM	
		There should be no "exceptional circumstances", no building should be allowed in any of these area.	Jul 29 2020 02:15 PM	See above
		Remove "except in exceptional circumstances"	Jul 29 2020 02:07 PM	See above
FI2	Community Facilities	old school house (now derelict) on corner of Lower Road should be given back to village.	Jul 25 2020 10:29 AM	Noted - refer to PC Privately owned property
		No comments.	Jul 23 2020 05:13 PM	
		WE NEED A SHOP OR SOMETHING	Jul 19 2020 03:07 PM	Noted - refer to PC
		FI2: Support but pity there aren't community facilities in Postcombe	Jul 16 2020 07:26 PM	Noted - refer to PC
		New people moving in important for survival and indeed flourishing of the schools, shops, pubs.  Outside play area in	Jul 16 2020 06:16 PM	Noted - refer to PC

		Postcombe would improve the village too		
		There are no community facilities to speak of within Postcombe and any new development cannot therefore conserve these. It would be preferable if some thought could be given to provide a community meeting place within the village.	Jul 06 2020 07:53 PM	Noted - refer to PC
		This type of development of access and services sets to really spoil the area and is one of the key reasons I am opposed to development in the area. We are already at max capacity and alterations to allow for more housing will be hugely detrimental. I myself would love affordable housing in the area and am someone these developments is probably aimed at and has in mind, but sadly the cost to the area is just far too high to develop and it would just serve to provide for our greed	Jul 04 2020 03:30 PM	Noted
		None	Jul 04 2020 10:03 AM	

		There is no mention of the Postcombe Reading Room (now derelict) in the draft plan. This is clearly something which needs to be in the plan. Obviously if the decision is to ignore it then that should be stated. It was donated to the village in 1860 and it is sad that it has been allowed to become derelict.	Jul 29 2020 06:00 PM	Noted - refer to PC Privately owned property
		As stated above, the Postcombe Reading Room is a village community asset, sadly fallen into disuse and now in a very bad condition. The plan should make mention of this and put forward some plan for it. Obviously if the conclusion is that nothing can be done to revive it then this should be stated in the plan.	Jul 29 2020 04:47 PM	Noted - refer to PC Privately owned property
F13	Sustainable Movement	Although in agreement regarding "safe" routes is a good thing, the rural character of the Parish needs to be protected too. Creating pavements needs to be carefully considered especially by residents who they are closest to. Plus how the upkeep of new	Jul 25 2020 10:37 PM	The policy is about footpaths which are not necessarily pavements and upkeep depends on the PC and land owners

		cycle/footpaths is agreed on, so as not to fall into disrepair		
		more safe cycle lanes within Parish - smaller roads becoming lethal; extension of lower speed limits	Jul 25 2020 10:30 AM	Refer to PC
		No comments.	Jul 23 2020 05:13 PM	
		Although agreement regarding "safe" routes in itself, can be a good thing, the rural character of the Parish needs to be protected too. Creating pavements would need to be carefully agreed to, especially by residents who they are closest to, plus any upkeep of new cycle or footpaths into the future would have to have agreement beforehand so as not to fall into disrepair	Jul 18 2020 05:41 PM	The policy is about footpaths which are not necessarily pavements and upkeep depends on the PC and land owners
		Neither support or object on paper  Not sure that this might not alter the character of the countryside	Jul 17 2020 09:23 PM	Generally supportive but concern of impact of paths on rural character. Policies collectively mean that they need to be sympathetic.
		Should be a greater ask on local authorities/farmers to keep footpaths/bridleways	Jul 16 2020	Refer to PC

		around Postcombe well cut/maintained in Summer	07:26 PM	
		Postcombe doesnt have a school, very few areas that could support a dedicated cycle route and teh current footpaths are overgrown to the point of being un useable. As this point is mainly for Lewknor it would be interesting to understand how all the footpaths etc will be maintained in teh other villages and not just Lewknor	Jul 06 2020 07:55 PM	Refer to PC
		The school already needs this, at current capacity it's extremely dangerous so adding in further development would make this danger unmanageable	Jul 04 2020 03:31 PM	Supportive
		None	Jul 04 2020 10:04 AM	
		Pressure needs to be constantly exerted on OCC (eg along the A40) and/or landowners (eg Path No 277/4) to maintain existing roadside and rural footpaths	Jun 26 2020 10:33 AM	Refer to PC
		Not a direct issue but there needs to be a better understanding of the different	Jun 15 2020	Refer to PC

		types of public access & restrictions (for example cyclists using footpaths from which they are excluded). Improved but discrete signage?	10:27 AM	
		I assume that just because a proposal which provides safe pedestrian routes does not mean it will be supported if it breaches other policies.	Jun 14 2020 06:05 PM	Correct!
F14	Green Energy	No comments.	Jul 23 2020 05:13 PM	Noted
		I've got a vested interest. 01844 281504	Jul 19 2020 11:36 AM	Noted
		Solar PV tiles have been refused in properties overlooking the church. I do not support this. We should all make an effort to use / generate green energy!	Jul 19 2020 11:22 AM	Noted - single response for this view
		No response recorded here somehow! J Knight	Jul 16 2020 07:56 PM	
		Not averse to green energy but concerned detail of Cornwell Solar and Harlesford	Jul 16 2020	Not relevant to NP - for PC

		Solar Farm Tetsworth could infringe of (on?) decision re proposal of new town Harrington near Great Milton which I would strongly oppose. This area is getting spoilt Thame – Chinnor & surrounding villages enough houses – encl. copy of details.	07:31 PM	
		I would not welcome a large solar farm nor wind turbines next to the village but there is a need to look for renewable energy schemes of low impact to the area.	Jul 06 2020 07:56 PM	Noted
		None	Jul 04 2020 10:04 AM	Noted
		Note only. Protection of views is CH3, not CH4	Jun 19 2020 04:06 PM	Noted and changed
		A good idea but will anybody actually install (retro-fit) a CHP/district heating system? Would be great if they did.	Jun 15 2020 10:29 AM	Noted
F15	Utilities	Is there or will there be any future installation of a suitable sewer network / system for the properties in Salt Lane ?	Jul 26 2020 10:07 AM	Noted not in remit of NP - refer to PC

		Again, mains drainage for Postcombe should be a Human right WITHOUT having to pay a massive connection charge.	Jul 25 2020 10:31 AM	Noted not in remit of NP - refer to PC
		Any improvements in local utilities, and here we would include the two local schools, should be assessed and improvements made before the relevant development is completed. It seems that typically and quite wrongly, the impact on utilities are often assessed and any improvements made after a development is completed.	Jul 23 2020 05:15 PM	Already supported by policies or these are existing problems not really relevant to NP
		I would also expect the PC to ensure that those of us who live outside the village benefit too and for the PC to gain a written agreement from any development companies to pay for infrastructure development.	Jul 19 2020 11:22 AM	Noted not in remit of NP - refer to PC
		Difficult one to decide. I do not see how you support any Commercial Development without considerable disruption to surrounding dwellings and roads	Jul 17 2020 09:23 PM	Noted - Policy does constrain size and impact of development
		Postcombe needs mains drainage	Jul 16 2020	Noted not in remit of NP - refer to PC



			08:17 PM	
		<p>There are a large number of houses in Postcombe that are not connected to the main sewer network. Some areas experience surface flooding therefore something needs to be in place to ensure that this doesnt cause issues in the future.</p> <p>As regards broadband it is unlikely that we will receive fibre optic connections as our telecom provision is on overhead cables. The broadband speeds are somewhat erratic and there have been several occasions where the connection drops for no reason.</p>	Jul 06 2020 07:59 PM	Noted not in remit of NP - refer to PC
		Support this concept but not in relation to the development that I oppose	Jul 04 2020 03:32 PM	Noted
		None	Jul 04 2020 10:04 AM	

		Landscaping of gardens should avoid concreting/hard driveways etc which all add to run off. Encourage water capture.	Jun 15 2020 10:31 AM	Covered by Sustainable Drainage Systems mentioned in this policy
		There is no mention of the absence of mains drainage in Postcombe which is a major issue and should be addressed.	Jul 29 2020 06:02 PM	Noted not in remit of NP - refer to PC
		We do not object to the above save that the issue of mains drainage in Postcombe is an issue which needs to be addressed in this plan.	Jul 29 2020 04:51 PM	Noted not in remit of NP - refer to PC
		Not all areas are connected to mains sewage.	Jul 29 2020 02:17 PM	Noted not in remit of NP - refer to PC
		We need something to cover septic tanks etc in Soth Weston and Postcombe where no infrastructure sewerage system exists	Jul 29 2020 02:11 PM	Noted not in remit of NP - refer to PC
FI6	Employment, Economic and Commercial Development	No comments.	Jul 23 2020 05:15 PM	

		Clarity required about business definitions that may not be compatible with the character of the Parish.	Jul 19 2020 04:40 PM	It is beyond the scope of the NP to specify the type of business and is the role of the PC/SODC/Planning Inspector to decide what is compatible with the character of the parish
		We could really use a shop in the village. Just a local one	Jul 19 2020 03:09 PM	Noted
		Personal use polytunnels and greenhouses in back gardens should not be refused!	Jul 19 2020 11:22 AM	This policy refers to commercial development and does not prevent the use of polytunnels etc in their own gardens
		I would add that businesses should support the clean air and water of the parish. This would help to minimise the likelihood of a planning application to keep large scale poultry or pig farms in the area.	Jul 07 2020 10:38 PM	
		We do not want flying, gliding or parachuting activities or any noisy activity (including motor bike scrambles) in the local area. These sorts of activities are not caught by the wording above.	Jul 07 2020 09:43 AM	Covered by the policy FI6 sections i and ii
		I do not believe that we should be entertaining any commercial developments within the villages. The area is of outstanding natural beauty and unless the business is	Jul 06 2020 08:01 PM	Noted - but if all commercial development was prohibited it would be rejected by the inspector

		agricultural (farming) I believe that any commercial development would ruin the character of the area, bring additional traffic through the villages and affect the roads and safety.		
		I don't see a requirement for this type of development. In the local area a lot of business premises have been subsequently changed to use for dwelling and so clearly there wasn't enough need and the buildings now serve to add to the number of residents living in the areas which is now at capacity	Jul 04 2020 03:33 PM	Noted - but if all commercial development was prohibited it would be rejected by the inspector
		None	Jul 04 2020 10:04 AM	
		Traffic - volume (vehicle numbers) can be as significant as size. Is one large lorry a day worse better than 20 vans. Suggest reference to volume be added.	Jun 15 2020 10:33 AM	Noted

		<p>We do not support this policy because it seems to be in danger of lacking any vision for the future. Postcombe is a village with excellent communications links and without any local employment possibilities for the young. With no employment possibilities and no affordable housing there is a risk of the village dying. We do not understand why any business needs to be compatible with the character of the village, and it is possible for development to take place in the village or immediately on the outskirts of the current footprint of the village which could provide employment to the young. We would encourage the committee to rethink this policy, in particular in the post covid-19 environment where local jobs may become far more important.</p>	<p>Jul 29 2020 06:07 PM</p>	<p>These comments are by representatives of the Adwell Estate, landowners of land adjoining Postcombe. This policy is supportive of appropriate commercial development and is supported by 97% of residents of Postcombe and of all respondents.</p>
HO1	Housing Mix	<p>I personally feel that there has been enough residential development in all three villages for the foreseeable future</p>	<p>Jul 27 2020 08:30 AM</p>	<p>Noted</p>

	I strongly agree with this proposal, all to often developers appear to adhere to the local area needs, only to then add a dwelling that doesn't fulfil a local need	Jul 25 2020 10:42 PM	Noted
	No comments.	Jul 23 2020 05:16 PM	n/a
	What are current requirements of the Parish which are not being delivered?	Jul 19 2020 04:41 PM	Surveys carried out as part of LPNP process identified residents needs within the remit of the NP and feedback was available to residents at walk in events across the parish
	I strongly agree with this proposal, all to often developers appear to adhere to the local area needs, only to then add a dwelling that doesn't fulfil a local need	Jul 18 2020 05:40 PM	Noted
	Neither support or object on paper What is meant by 'mixed'?	Jul 17 2020 09:23 PM	The PC and SODC will determine the appropriate prevailing housing mix at the relevant time

	Mix of size and types to attract wide range of family sizes and ages and incomes.	Jul 16 2020 06:16 PM	This is what we hope to achieve by engaging in the NP process for the parish
	I personally do not know of any plans for a residential development and "a mix of properties" sounds too vague to support.	Jul 13 2020 11:35 AM	The PC and SODC will determine the appropriate prevailing housing mix needs of the parish at the relevant time and this wording permits changes overtime to be accounted for
	We absolutely need more affordable housing	Jul 09 2020 04:30 PM	Noted
	A stated before the village has a responsibility to welcome younger adults into the area by providing starter homes. Many of the current residents have clearly benefited from these being build in the past. It cannot only be about the needs of current residents, if these needs are acting as a barrier to the wider rural population.	Jul 07 2020 10:38 PM	Prevailing needs' would include the needs of the people growing up and staying in the parish
	Needs to supply a high percentage of affordable housing for local people.	Jul 06 2020	Noted

			09:15 PM	
		Don't see any requirement for it	Jul 04 2020 03:33 PM	Noted
		None	Jul 04 2020 10:05 AM	n/a
		We need a reference to needs both current and future with an ability to adapt overtime. As WFH becomes more common this will possibly change demand and move from cities to rural areas will doubtless impact post Covid-19.	Jun 15 2020 10:35 AM	The PC and SODC will determine the appropriate prevailing housing mix needs of the parish at the relevant time and this wording permits changes overtime to be accounted for
TH1	CHANGE POLICY NAME TO <b>SUSTAINA</b>	No comments.	Jul 23 2020 05:16 PM	N/A



	<b>BLE TRANSPOR T</b>	Speed management needs significant attention given the number of serious incidents in the last 6 months. This has been in areas with multiple transitions in speed in areas with a high number of bend and camber. I would like to see a reduced speed limit, say 40mph for most of these areas only reducing to 30mph where there is higher risk or residential properties. There need to be more advance warning of the transition and consideration needs to be given to reducing speed limits in villages to 20mph	Jul 19 2020 04:45 PM	refer to Parish Council
		NO RESPONSE  Bring back the Watlington Bunk (railway line) Vested Interest	Jul 19 2020 11:37 AM	refer to Parish Council
		In order to support this I would like to see engagement with the Oxford tube & for them to manage the areas used for parking	Jul 19 2020 11:22 AM	refer to Parish Council
		It should also be a requirement that developments that have at least two parking spaces for each dwelling should have	Jul 18 2020 05:40 PM	Add this to Policy DC2 viii along the lines of parking arrangements "should have a minimal impct on the street scene"

	some of the spaces allocated out of view of the "street scene"		
	Too much traffic noise from the M40 and A40 in any case	Jul 17 2020 09:24 PM	not within remit of NP. Refer to parish Council
	M40 bus link is really important to be maintained (at Jn6).	Jul 16 2020 06:16 PM	not within remit of NP. Refer to parish Council
	I would oppose any development that would significantly increase traffic to the village.	Jul 13 2020 11:36 AM	policy aims to minimise traffic increase as a result of development
	With no bus connection or other public transport it is difficult to see how any development would not lead to increased traffic demand. A travel plan therefore would be ineffective.	Jul 06 2020 08:03 PM	Noted
	No capacity whatsoever for significant increase in traffic and the accommodation of such a consequence would destroy the natural beauty of the area	Jul 04 2020 03:34 PM	policy aims to minimise this
	None	Jul 04 2020 10:05 AM	N/A

		It has to be acknowledged in the plan that Postcombe has a major trunk road running through it. Potentially his makes the prospect of an increase in traffic far less of a threat to the village.	Jul 29 2020 06:09 PM	Noted
TH2	VEHICLE TRAFFIC	Item 1 I am in agreement with, but Item 2 would be almost impossible to implement because of the sheer cost of purchasing land. Instead residents could be encouraged to plant along their own boundaries to naturally "screen" from the M40 and B4009	Jul 25 2020 10:53 PM	policy only applies to land being developed, refer to Parish council
		Approaching local landowners beside M40 with incentives to do more tree planting or even consideration of bunds	Jul 25 2020 10:33 AM	refer to Parish Council
		No comments.	Jul 23 2020 05:16 PM	n/a
		See earlier observation	Jul 19 2020 04:46 PM	See comment re speed management TH1

	Let's see this outside of the village areas too. B4009 for example!	Jul 19 2020 11:22 AM	refer to Parish Council
	Item 1 I am in agreement with, however 2 would be almost impossible to implement because of the sheer cost of purchasing land. Instead residents could be encouraged to plant along their own boundaries to naturally "screen" from the M40 or B4009	Jul 18 2020 05:39 PM	policy only applies to land being developed, refer to Parish council
	Noted	Jul 17 2020 09:24 PM	noted
	Traffic calming measures very much needed on A40 through Postcombe – some people are driving at 50 mph plus, some easily 60/65 mph plus...	Jul 16 2020 07:26 PM	refer to Parish Council
	Bit difficult to screen Lewknor from motorway noise as the noisy part is from the bridge / flyover. But I would support if it was possible to plant trees there, as long as the trees fit in with the natural biodiversity of the area.	Jul 13 2020 11:38 AM	Noted
	As previously expressed - I am opposed to the notion of any	Jul 04 2020	Noted

		such development that brings about an significant increase In traffic and so these measures are irrelevant	03:35 PM	
		None	Jul 04 2020 10:05 AM	N/A
		Screening the M40 has been a long held ambition in the parish. The developers of the solar parks at Tetsworth might like to consider potentially creating the screening on that section as part of their commitment to biodiversity & habitat creation.	Jun 15 2020 10:37 AM	Outside Plan area